IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.1273 OF 2005

Mrs.Chanda Sopan Avate & Ors. .. Petitioners

vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and Others .. Respondents.

alongwith

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.1274 OF 2005

Mrs.Uma Sunil Bhaskaran & Ors. .. Petitioner

vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and Others .. Respondents.

alongwith

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.1275 OF 2005

Mr. Krishna Lokre & Ors. .. Petitioner

vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and Others .. Respondents.

alongwith

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.1276 OF 2005

Mr. Geal Domnic D’Souza .. Petitioner

vs.

State of Maharashtra
& Others .. Respondents.

Mr.Saikumar Ramamurthy with L. Satelkar, Asstt. G.P. for Respondent No.1.

Mr.G.D. Utangale for respondent No.2.

CORAM : Dr.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD

DATED : 6th May, 2005.

P.C. :

1. In these matters the grievance of the petitioners is that the developer has not entered into any agreement in regard to the provision of transit accomodation and permanent alternative accommodation in respect of hutment dwellers who are found eligible to participate in the scheme of Slum Rehabilitation. The learned Counsel who appears on behalf of the developer has filed an affidavit-in-reply on behalf of the developer in this proceeding. The learned counsel states that those amongst the petitioners whose eligibility has been certified by the SRA will be provided with transit accommodation and, upon permanent alternative accommodation being ready, with permanent accommodation in accordance with the terms of the scheme.

2. The learned counsel appearing for SRA states that within a period of one week from today, the authority shall inspect the transit

accommodation which is being provided by the developer. Subject to the certification of the transit accommodation by the authority as being fit and habitable for accommodation, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners states that the petitioners shall immediately upon such certification shift to the transit accommodation. In the event that the SRA comes to the conclusion that the transit accommodation is not fit for occupation, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the developer states that the developer shall take steps to provide alternative accommodation subject to the due satisfaction of the SRA with regard to the safety and fitness of the accommodation. In view of this statement, no further directions are necessary and since no other points are raised, the petitions are disposed of.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the SRA states that extracts of Annexure II in relation to the certification by the authority for each of the petitioners shall be furnished to the petitioners within a period of one week from today.

(Dr.D.Y.Chandrachud, J.)